

United States District Court

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

DORIAN JULIAS BRANDT

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Case Number: 1:09-CR-229

In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. §3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require the detention of the defendant pending trial in this case.

Part I - Findings of Fact

(1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a (federal offense) (state or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed) that is

- a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. §3156(a)(4).
- an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death.
- an offense for which the maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in _____
- a felony that was committed after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses.

(2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense.

(3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the (date of conviction) (release of the defendant from imprisonment) for the offense described in finding (1).

(4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an)other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption.

Alternate Findings (A)

(1) There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense

- for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in 21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq _____
- under 18 U.S.C. §924(c).

(2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.

Alternate Findings (B)

(1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.

(2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the safety of another person or the community.

Defendant has 3 long-standing warrants (2 are related) pending against him from the states of Illinois and Florida. One of these warrants has a "no bond" condition. Although defendant assures his counsel that these warrants have been cleared up, there is no other evidence to this effect and the warrants remain outstanding according to the Pretrial Services office. In light of the various charges against the defendant over the years for crimes of dishonesty (e.g., non-sufficient funds, theft, theft by deception, fraudulent activities, forgery, dealing in stolen property, forgery, uttering), the court is disinclined to accept defendant's representation on its face. Moreover, the warrant from Illinois appears to (continued on attachment)

Part II - Written Statement of Reasons for Detention

I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence that

no condition(s) will assure the safety of the community or the appearance of the defendant in light of the unrebutted presumption. In the alternative, the court finds that the government has shown by the preponderance of the evidence that there are no condition or combination of conditions that will assure the defendant's presence in court, based in particular on the outstanding warrants against him.

Part III - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Dated: October 30, 2009

/s/ Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr.

Signature of Judicial Officer

Hugh W. Brenneman, United States Magistrate Judge

Name and Title of Judicial Officer

*Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. §955a).

United States v. **DORIAN JULIAS BRANDT**

1:09-CR-229

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Page 2.

Alternate Findings (B) - (continued)

have resulted from the police being unable to arrest the defendant, while the no bond warrant out of Florida arises from an alleged probation violation, presumably a failure to appear or report. Even if the warrants are no longer outstanding due to age, the conduct giving rise to them would suggest plaintiff is not a good risk.

Part II - Written Statement of Reasons for Detention - (continued)